5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

subsistence shifting agriculture alone. This leaves hardly any margin for land unsuitable for cultivation, for bush land needed as a source of building materials etc., or for unequal distribution of land as between families.

We may divide the land occupied by Orokaiva into two broad sub-regions. The first is made up of the foothills themselves which have an 8 to 12 inch very dark brown top soil, rich in nitrogen and phosphorus. The fine-textured subsoils range from 10 to 22 inches in depth. This sub-region coincides approximately with the Saiho census division which had a population of 8,211 in 1966 giving a density of about 55 per sq. mile. The second sub-region, situated to the north and east of the first, consists of poorly drained but readily improvable plains. Here the population is very much sparser. Most village domains contain only a fraction of immediately utilisable good cultivation land and even this does not have the special fertility of the volcanic loam on the mountain slopes. The soils of Inoda, a village situated in this sub-region, have been discussed in much detail by Crocombe and Hogbin 1963, quoting the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (C.S.I.R.O. [1954]). This sub-region forms part of the Sohe-Popondetta census division which, as a whole, has a population density of about 20 per sq. mile. Villages are smaller and more dispersed.

The boundaries of what we may call the Orokaiva tribal area are probably best determined by the criteria used by the Papuans themselves, namely linguistic criteria. Orokaiva is part of the Binandere group of eight languages (see Wurm 1960) spoken in most of the more densely populated parts of the Northern District; of these languages, Orokaiva is spoken by the greatest number, but only about half the population in the Ovokaiva-Binandere area. The only language of this group for which a reasonably full description (grammar and dictionary) has been published is Binandere (Copland King 1927), a language spoken around the lower part of the Mambare and Gira rivers. Other languages of this group are: Orokaiva, Notu, Aiga, Huniara, Yema, Taindaware. While there are considerable vocabularly differences between these languages, there is a close resemblance in grammar and enough resemblance in vocabularly to make a very limited degree of intercommunication possible. (Chinnery and Beaver 1916 and an unpublished manuscript by Capell [n.d.]). We do not know much more about the Binandere group of languages except that it is a Papuan grouping (Grace 1968).

It seems to me that dialect divisions within the Orokaiva language area which have been noted at various times (Beaver 1916, Williams 1930) are rather minor. A fairly accurate idea of the boundaries of the Orokaiva language area may be obtained by identifying this area with the district administered by the Higaturu Local Government Council which covers the Saiho and most of the Sohe-Popondetta census divisions.

Williams (1930: 157–9) attempts to distinguish the Orokaiva language speakers from other tribal groupings by listing cultural differences (notably in dress and ornaments) but these are not pronounced and, under modern conditions, may be observed only on ceremonial occasions when headgear and bark-cloth are worn.

Prior to European contact, the normal mode of settlement was in hamlets containing 6 to 12 houses and surrounded by land used for shifting agriculture.

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 18]

Chapter 1

Introduction

There is no local consensus as to which peoples in the Northern District should be regarded as Orokaiva (see Williams 1930:1-4), but all the peoples concerned recognize that they have a relatively uniform culture and speak mutually intelligible dialects of one language. The people in this culture area number at least 25,000.

Although they did not have an inclusive name for themselves until 'Orokaiva' was introduced by Europeans, they generally drew the distinctions among themselves between river people, salt water people, and inland people (umo-ke, eva'embo and periho). There are wide-spread traditional beliefs dealing with the common origins not only of these different categories of people, but also of mutually hostile tribes, the largest political units among them, and of the various dialectal groupings and local cultural variants, which correspond to a limited extent with the political division into tribes.[1]

Our study of Sivepe was designed to complement a study of land, work and productivity at Inonda village (Crocombe and Hogbin 1963) and other related studies in the area (Dakeyne 1965; Howlett 1965; Crocombe 1964; and Cheetham). We attempt no general comparison with the results of the other studies at this stage.

Because land tenure problems were central to our investigations, the groups at Inonda and Sivepe were chosen from villages in the Higaturu Native Local Government Council area which is occupied by about 12,000 of the Orokaiva. In 1956 this council adopted a scheme to register individual title to parcels of land which would be allocated by land-holding groups to individual members for use as cash-crop gardens. The scheme had encountered several

[1] See Williams 1930:155; W.47, 140, 148; O.40, 411, 486, 598, 640; Folktales Nos.45, 54. W.47,... O.40,... Folktales, etc., refer to the notation used by Williams in his fieldnotes, see Bibliography, p.121.

each separated geographically from its neighbours.[1] There is also Williams' point (W.28) that in 1923 there was unclaimed land adjoining the 'hamlets' in the unit named Wasida (i.e., Jegasi-Sarahu). Like most other districts this consisted of two 'hamlet groups'. Norton (1962:6) says that sometimes villages, which 'are known to have been quite large' and stockaded (cf. Williams 1930:67, 164-6), were separated by tracts of unclaimed virgin land until the time of the suppression of feuding.

This combination for better defence may have been characteristic of tribes throughout the Orokaiva area. We believe, however, that the subdividing of the tribe into discrete named groups of named villages (either district or 'hamlet group') would be unique to the mountain Orokaiva in the culture area; we do not have enough evidence to show if this feature is related to the earlier clustering for safety, and to the greater population density in this tribe.

The emergence of tribal subdivisions at this level, however limited or occasional their independence, seems consistent with the uncertainties encountered by observers in seeking to determine the limits, the local name and the distinctive cultural and linguistic characteristics of the inclusive political unit.[2]

At this point we shall identify the local patrilineal groups to be mentioned in the following resumé of the history of local settlement and then make a preliminary comment on landholding by individuals.

The members of Jegase clan in Sivepe are divided among 4 named subgroups, each claiming to trace its origins to either of 2 contiguous villages occupied by all the ancestors of the Jegase in the neighbourhood. We shall call these subgroups lineages; they are Bebehupa,[3] Sesewopa, Berekipa and Arehu. A fifth lineage called Hambai or Hambai'embo has died out only in the present generation, yet all but the key members of the group and a little

---

[1] Seldom does the territory of a 'district' at present clearly appear distinct from others, and that of a 'hamlet group' even more rarely.

[2] Either 'parish' or 'subtribe' could be considered as a term for such a unit within the tribe. But rather than add to the confusion of terms used in descriptions of local organization we retain the terms which we have already adopted.

[3] The suffix -pa (or -ja, female) should strictly be used in addressing or referring to an individual member, but it now seems to be common local usage to refer to a group itself in this way, and we shall follow this usage.

Introduction

121 The New Guinea Research Unit of the School of Pacific Studies of the Australian National University invited the author to evaluate the cognitive ability of groups of subjects who were being studied as part of a larger project. These were the Orokaiva people of the Northern District of Papua. Other related studies in the area had been or were being carried out at Inonda (Crocombe and Hogbin 1963), Gona (Dakeyne 1965), Sivepe and Borugasusu (Rimoldi 1966a, b), Ongoho (Crocombe 1964), the ex-servicemen's settlement scheme (Cheetham 1963) and in expatriate plantations (Howlett 1965).

131 The Orokaiva live on the Popondetta plain and in the Mt Lamington
197 foothills, and share mutually understandable languages. They have been described by Crocombe (1963) as follows:

105 The Orokaiva people number roughly 26,000 and are divided
[161] into about twelve tribes. The tribes are very loose units
[619] and recognise no single leader and before European contact,
[423] warfare within the tribe was not uncommon. ...there are no
[614] land rights at a tribal level. Each tribe is divided into a number of named clans. A clan is seldom localised, and usually it is divided into a number of sub-clans which are dispersed over various parts of the tribal territory. Each sub-clan holds rights over a specific area or areas of land.

177 There has been European contact of some form over a long period.
795 The people are perhaps best known by the work of Williams (1928 and 1930) in which he describes the earlier cult movements and the attempts to master and control new contact situations. Two of these were the cult of the Baigona men and the Taro cult. The former was concerned with healing and sorcery through a type of priest who was in communication with the spirits of the dead and now resident in various reptiles, particularly the snake. The latter was evidenced in sorcery through a priest who was possessed with the spirit of the Taro. Violent dancing or ecstatic movements often accompanied by a trance were not unlike the dance of St Vitus or St John which swept Europe in the fourteenth century (Sargant 1957).

648 The initial Japanese occupation of Papua took place in the
177 Northern District as the Japanese marched towards Port Moresby via

for short periods as indentured labourers on the newly-established European plantations or on the wharves of Port Moresby or Samarai. Most men sampled the novelty for a short time but quickly returned to the village; some showed little interest in the wider life introduced by the white men but a few were greatly influenced and spent years away from home in paid employment such as the Papuan Constabulary.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The Yega constitute a social and political unit and regard themselves as separate and distinct from the similar groups around them, even though all speak mutually understandable dialects of the same language. Each of these groups may therefore be termed a parish. Before the enforced abandonment of warfare early this century, these parishes lived in a situation of constant enmity and changing military alliances. In the absence of effective natural barriers on the plain, each group concentrated upon the production of its food supplies as close as possible to its home villages; tracts of forest which served as hunting areas and as reservoirs of wild food and building materials also served as 'no man's lands' surrounding the territory of each parish group. As hunting rights to these forest areas were obtained by daring individuals who ventured far into them, near the swidden areas of neighbouring groups, it is not surprising that such

[P.5-B]

Section 3: Social Environment

619 In discussing the Waseta "tribe" I suggested that its boundaries would be hard to establish and that it gave little evidence of any sense of unity. The case of Sangara is somewhat different; first of [197] all, Sangara speaks a dialect of its own that is easily distinguishable from that of other areas. Secondly, a Sangara man is able, if he is knowledgeable enough, to list some 27 villages which formed a loose military alliance, and between which raids and organised ward did not [582] occur. These 27 villages formed at the same time an area within which intermarriage would regularly occur. The present population of Hohorita and the adjunct villages is drawn entirely from this alliance. (The number 27 is probably an underestimate.)

621 Since the government made Sangara the centre of the Northern District immediately after the war, patrols were active in the Sangara [659] district to amalgamate villages. A number of the people now living in Hohorita report that they came from such consolidated villages, such as Tunana, which absorbed three neighbouring villages just before the eruption. Informants say that the clusters of villages joined together in this way had always been closely related. The population of Hohorita is more diverse. I was at first told that it was composed of households of four clans (Horeopa, Oripa, Besupa and Sehopa), the first two clans being in the front village and the last two in the back village. A house-to-house census revealed representatives of a further eight clans, sometimes survivors of clans that had otherwise died out, sometimes a clan more fully represented in Kakita or Sombou while two clan names came from the Sasembata district, under circumstances to be discussed later. Furthermore, when a number of families came from the same clan, they were not always from the same village. While Sombou was inhabited by the remnants of one cluster of four villages, and Kakita by the remnants of one village, Hohorita offered a more general hospitality to all Sangara.

621 Because of their history, the four Sangara villages built since 629 the eruption form a rather tight cluster, quite different from the intersecting circle pattern I described for the Sasembata district. When a person in Sombou died, the whole of Hohorita rushes to join the wake. All four villages in the cluster do this for each other, but [731] not for any other village. Because of the sharp drop in population, and the way the survivors were thrown together after the disaster, people who were previously bound together only by a very loose alliance now behave in the same way as a small neighbourhood cluster of closely related villages.

Meanwhile, the Sangara people are rapidly developing friendships and affinal links outside the tribe. In 1966, the front half of Hohorita gave a feast for Koipa (a large Isivita resettlement village), the back half gave a feast for Asigi, Irihambo gave a feast for Hohorita while Sombou, with the assistance of Kakita, entertained the Uhuru'undi

25: Schwimmer E-5 (1966-1970) 1974 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

562 through the close brother-sister links that endure after marriage and that are expressed through strong links between sister's son and mother's brother. 614 Genealogies are brief, but the Orokaiva classify themselves into supposedly agnatic units by grouping together persons who respect the same plant [582] emblem which is treated as an ancestor. Clans are dispersed, and although local clan groups continue relations after dispersal, they soon begin to intermarry.

602 In the Orokaiva *philia* system, the distinction consanguine/non-consanguine occurs, but only feebly. Far more important are three cross-cutting categories which may be briefly summarized as follows: 1) the cooperative alliance, centred on sibling and parental bonds; 2) the competitive group exchange system, centred on relations with affines and uterines; 3) the total interdependence relations existing between spouses and cross-cousins.

Previously (Schwimmer, 1970a; 1970b; 1972), I have shown that the Orokaiva kinship universe may be viewed as made up of these three main components. In particular, the symbolization of the conjugal bond does not coincide with either the cooperative or the competitive mode, but is expressed in the symbiosis of plants (such as coconut and areca) which exhibit both binary opposition and total interdependence relationships. The cross-cousin bond has the same components and, at least in ideology, a comparable strength.

121 In this essay, I shall present data on the friendship universe and show that 572 Orokaiva have institutionalized friendships of several types, some of which 602 are hereditary. I hope to show that each type of friendship corresponds to one of the basic categories of the kin universe. Thus, if my argument is correct, the same categories would hold for the entire *philia* universe of which kinship and friendship would become homomorphous components. Friendship would not have one specific idiom, but a set of idioms which have already been stated in *philia* ideology and symbolized in the religio-philosophic system. Friendship thus becomes a dynamic dimension of kinship. Superficially, it looks like a minor supplement of the kinship system, but it is essential in filling ever-widening lacunae in the kinship system and preventing progressive entropy.

Orokaiva Kin and Friendship Idioms

101 Between the districts where the data were collected, there are slight differ- 197 ences in dialect (Hohorita in the Sangara district and Sivepe in the Sasembata 601 district), including the way kin and friendship terms are used. The Sangara and Sasembata people are tribe-like groups, hereditary enemies, with seemingly similar social organizations.

601 Provisionally, it is best to regard the Sangara and Sasembata nomenclatures as variants of the same system. I shall not deal here with intergenerational terminology since it is mainly used in a familial context, whereas